

REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the final Office Action dated January 6, 2010, and is filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination. Claims 1-6 and 8-11 remain pending and claim 7 was previously canceled. By this communication, claims 1 and 9 are amended. Support for the subject matter recited in claim 1 can be found, for example, in Fig. 5 of the disclosure.

Allowed Claims

Applicants appreciate the designation of claim 11 as allowed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

In numbered paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for alleged unpatentability over Applicants' admitted prior art *Oki et al* (JP 2002209193A) in view of *Bishop et al* (U.S. Patent No. 4,910,683). Further, in numbered paragraph 4 on page 7 of the Office Action, claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Oki* in view of *Bishop*, and further in view of *Potrebic et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,804,824); and in numbered paragraph 5 on page 8 of the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected for allegedly unpatentability over *Oki et al* in view of *Bishop*, and further in view of *Duso et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,750). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, wherein the video information distribution device comprises a schedule management section generating the image control signal on the basis of schedule data which specifies an

order and duration of displaying the dynamic image video information and the processed digital static image video information.

Oki is alleged to disclose every feature recited in independent claim 1 except for at least a schedule management section. *Bishop* is relied upon in an effort to remedy this deficiency.

Bishop discloses a system that displays video images using a fractional double buffering technique. As a result, a graphics CPU renders (writes) an object to be displayed in a display buffer that is not currently being displayed, while an object stored in another buffer is provided to a display. See Bishop, col. 5, lines 6-21. During operation, one display buffer is updated with new object data while the other display buffer is read by the display circuitry and its object displayed on the display. Particularly, a multiplexer alternately selects the display buffers, and presents the data to the display based on a control signal issued by the CPU. Id., col. 5, lines 22-29.

The alternate selection of the display buffers is not analogous to Applicants' claimed schedule management section. Namely, Applicants' claimed schedule management section specifies an order and duration of displaying the dynamic image video information and the processed digital static image video information through schedule data. See Applicants' disclosure, Fig. 5.

In contrast, *Bishop* discloses a system in which a multiplexer alternately selects the display buffers, and presents the data to the display based on a control signal issued by the CPU. Nothing in *Bishop* discloses or suggests that the system has a capability to select a display buffer based on a sequence of displaying the plural images and display the selected images according to a specified duration.

Rather, the multiplexer selects the display buffer without regard to the image to be displayed or the length of time at which the image is to be displayed. As such, *Bishop* places no constraint on either display order or duration of display respect to the images stored in the display buffer. One of ordinary skill would understand that *Bishop* cannot reasonably be interpreted as having a schedule management section as recited in Applicants' claims. In an Advisory Action dated April 22, 2010, the Examiner acknowledges that *Bishop* does not disclose or suggest the features described through Fig. 5 and now embodied in independent claim 1.

In summary, *Oki* and *Bishop* when applied individually or collectively fail to disclose or suggest every feature and/or the combination of features recited in Applicants' claims. Moreover, secondary references *Potrebic* and *Duso* do not disclose any features that one of ordinary skill would reasonably believes resolves the aforementioned deficiencies with respect to independent claim 1. For at least these reasons, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, and withdrawal of all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is proper.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6 and 8-11 are allowable and this application is in condition for allowance. In the event any issues adverse to allowance remain, the PTO is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: June 7, 2010

By: /Shawn B. Cage/
Shawn B. Cage
Registration No. 51522

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620